

From Yang–Mills Field to Solitons and back again

L.D. Faddeev

*Steklov Mathematical Institute, St.Petersburg
Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki*

I am here in Erice for the first time in my life. Of course I followed the activity of this famous School during the last 35 years via its Proceedings, some of which certainly influenced my scientific interests. But now I am able to watch the real work of the School and this is a great revelation. I am very grateful to Professors Zichichi, 't Hooft and Veneziano for inviting me here.

When I got the invitation, I decided to come and use the opportunity to speak in defence of Quantum Field Theory. The fact that I was to be the last speaker is certainly helpful for this goal. However, I found here that there is nobody present at the School to argue with. All my colleagues theorists apparently are in the mood of supporting QFT, at least in the guise of QCD. So it remains for me just to explain why I personally like QFT. Needless to say that my arguments will be significantly based on my own experience.

Quantum Field Theory is only a little younger than Quantum Mechanics. The realization of a field as a system of infinite number of oscillators was used to construct the quantization of fields already in 1928 by fathers of QM — Heisenberg, Pauli, Jordan, Dirac. My senior compatriot V. Fock entered the field almost at the same time. The first essential success of QFT, which at that time was Quantum Electrodynamics, was the resolution of the long standing contradiction in connection with the origin of light. Both wave and corpuscular aspects were united naturally in the quantum description of the free electromagnetic field: the quantized hamiltonian of the Maxwell wave equations has the particle-like excitations — photons. The subsequent calculations of the basic processes of interacting electrons and photons was a great success. However the infinities which appeared in the radiative corrections, became the uncircumventable obstacles for the following development and interest to QED temporarily declined in the end of 30-ties.

New great success of QED is connected with the understanding of the radiative corrections prompted by new experimental data during 1948–1953. Advent of the manifest Lorentz invariant formulation and renormalization by Tomonaga, Schwinger and Feynman allowed to calculate the Lamb shifts of atomic levels and anomalous magnetic moment of electron with great precision and agreement

with experiment. The general renormalization procedure, developed by Dyson, Salam, Bogolubov among others and based on Feynman diagrammatic approach to perturbation expansion, became a new paradigm of QFT. However, the (now looking) naive generalization of QED to strong nuclear forces with π -meson field substituting the electromagnetic field of QED, did not lead to satisfactory results. Even worse was the realization that the charge renormalization in QED leads to the increasing of the interactions for high energies. The extremal position in this respect was taken by Landau, who pronounced the Hamiltonian method (i.e. all QFT) dead in 1956. All this led to the second decline of QFT with interests of the theoreticians shifted to nondynamical S-matrix theory. In my country the QFT was virtually forbidden from the end of 50-ties for at least ten years. Fortunately for me I lived in Leningrad (now St.Petersburg, where I continue to stay) and worked in the Mathematical Institute; so I was not subject to the prevailing ideological trends in Soviet theoretical physics. So when in the middle of the 60-ties I decided to become seriously involved in QFT, I had no inhibitions. The search for a possible subject almost immediately led me to Yang-Mills field. There was no compelling physical reason to consider this field being charged and massless. However the beautiful geometric interpretation, which I learned from Lichnerowics's book on the theory of connections [1], was irresistible. One more reason to do YM was the influence of Feynman lecture of 1962 on quantization of Einstein Gravitation Theory [2]. The YM field was used there as a toy model, and Feynman found that the conventional diagrammatic rules of the perturbation theory do not work.

For reasons not understandable to me Feynman did not return to the fundamental source of his diagrammatic rules — namely, Feynman functional integral. Indeed, it is in the functional integral formalism where the specificity of the YM field can be seen most transparent. The equivalence principle states, that gauge equivalent fields are physically indistinguishable, so in the functional integral over all physical configurations one is to integrate over classes of equivalent fields, choosing one representative in each class. In QED the gauge orbit

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu^\varphi = A_\mu + \partial_\mu \varphi, \quad (1)$$

parametrized by a real function $\varphi(x)$ on space-time, is linear and typical gauge condition like $\partial_\mu A_\mu = 0$, serving for choice of representative, intersects all orbits with a fixed angle. In the case of nonabelian YM field the situation is different: the orbits

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu^g = g^{-1} A_\mu g + g^{-1} \partial_\mu g, \quad (2)$$

where $g(x)$ is a function on space-time with values in compact group G , are nonlinear and intersect the gauge surface $\partial_\mu A_\mu = 0$ with angle depending on orbit. What measures this angle is a determinant

$$\Delta(A) = \det \partial_\mu \nabla_\mu = \det (\square \partial_\mu + [A_\mu, \cdot]) \quad (3)$$

which certainly is to be taken into account in the functional integral.

This geometrical idea was formally realized by my collaborator V. Popov and me in the fall of 1966 and led to the concrete proposal for the modification of the diagrammatic rules for YM field. Due to the circumstances mentioned above, it was not possible to publish a long paper on this subject in any Soviet journal, so we used a very new opportunity of relative liberalization to send a short letter to Physics Letters [3] and published more extended version as a preprint [4] of just organized Kiev Institute of Theoretical Physics. Complete set of Feynman diagrammatic rules as well as interpretation of additional action due to (3) in terms of integral over fictitious fermions (now called ghosts) is contained in this preprint. Also the equivalence of manifestly covariant gauge and Coulomb gauge, where only physical degrees of freedom entered the functional intrgal, was established in this preprint. It showed the unitarity of the modified diagrammatic rules. More general discussion of the quantization of the constrained Hamiltonian systems (of which the Yang-Mills field theory gives a prominent example) was given by me in [5].

Later, when YM theory came to vogue, the English translation of Kiev preprint was published by B. Lee as a Fermilab preprint. However, in the middle of the 60-ties our results did not attract much attention. The evident reason was the lack of viable physical applications.

The situation changed drastically with 't Hooft's applications of Yang-Mills in the model with spontaneous breaking of the symmetry [6], which turns the charged components of vector field into the massive ones. The relevance of this model to the theory of weak interactions immediatly attracted a lot of attention of physicists.

The subsequent development including the dramatic history of the asymptotic freedom is described in 't Hooft's lecture at this School and in recent talk of D. Gross [7], so I must not repeat it. As a result, QFT was vindicated and returned to its well deserved position of the fundamental base for the theory of elementary particles. The Standard Model based on Yang-Mills field stands until now as a satisfactory description of all interactions but gravity.

In what follows I shall concentrate on some new features of the Third Advent of QFT, which distinguishes it from two previous periods.

The obvious drawback of pure YM theory — the absence of mass parameter in classical formulation — becomes, in fact, its asset. Indeed, the only parameter entering the theory is dimensionless coupling constant $1/g^2$, standing in front of action very much like Planck constant $1/\hbar$. The asymptotic freedom can be reformulated in the following way: the regularization introduces the cut-off momentum L of dimension of mass (for example, $L = 1/\Delta$, where Δ is lattice spacing) and with increase of L the coupling constant is to go to zero. The

explicit rule in the simplest approximation looks like

$$\ln \frac{L}{\mu} - \frac{c}{g^2} = \ln \frac{m}{\mu}, \quad (4)$$

where μ is an arbitrary scale and c is a positive constant depending on the gauge group. Two infinities in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, $g^2 \rightarrow 0$ in LHS are to cancel each other leaving finite RHS and introducing a new parameter m . The formula above can be rewritten as

$$m = Le^{-c/g^2} \quad (5)$$

expressing m via g^2 and L more explicitly.

Thus, the divergence in quantum version of YM field becomes the origin of appearance of mass, which substitutes the classical dimensionless coupling constant. This striking phenomenon was called “dimensional transmutation” by S. Coleman in his famous Erice lectures of 1973 [8].

I believe that this is one of the most important lessons of the new period of QFT: some infinities are not bad, on the contrary they are necessary for the physical applicability of QFT. At least one infinity is good. Of course the QCD using pure YM field without Higgs field is based on dimensional transmutation.

It is instructive to comment here, that there exists a simple example in ordinary Quantum Mechanics where formula like (4) is exact.

The hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} - g^2 \delta(x) \delta(y) \quad (6)$$

for two-dimensional particle interacting with a point source of strength g^2 is apparently scale invariant. However, one encounters a divergence which is circumvented by renormalization of g^2 exactly as in (4), thus trading it for dimensional parameter breaking scale invariance.

The view on importance of infinity for QFT advertized above was stressed also by R. Jackiw in [9].

Another paradigm of old QFT states that one is to introduce a separate field for each elementary particle. In view of increasing a list of such particles a new mechanism for mass spectrum allowing many particles to correspond to one or a few fields is needed. Of course, the Standard Model is quite happy with its 12 vector fields and 12 fermions; but any possible reduction of the number of constituents is certainly welcome.

A new mechanism of rich particle spectrum was found in quantum soliton theory. I believe, that in spite of the fact that we know about solitons already 25 years, their application to the theory of elementary particles only begins.

The term soliton appeared in applied plasma physics and was introduced by M. Kruskal and N. Zabuski to describe a solitary wave solution of one-dimensional nonlinear evolution equation, so called Korteweg-de-Vries (KdV) equation. In

spite of the fact that KdV equation is very far from relativistic physics, it surfaced several times in HEP-TH in connection with Conformal Field Theory (CFT) and Matrix Models. However another equation admitting solitons is more relevant for us now. It is the so-called Sine-Gordon equation

$$\varphi_{tt} - \varphi_{xx} + \frac{m^2}{\beta} \sin \beta \varphi = 0 \quad , \quad (7)$$

which describes massive scalar field $\varphi(x)$ in 1+1 dimensional space-time; parameter β is a coupling constant.

The pure step

$$\varphi_0(x, t) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < x_0 \\ \frac{2\pi}{\beta} & x > x_0 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

is a formal stationary solution for all $x \neq x_0$. There exists also a regular stationary solution,

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{4}{\beta} \arctan e^{mx} \quad (9)$$

which formally converges to φ_0 when $m \rightarrow \infty$. Both solutions connect two adjacent vacua $\varphi = 0$ at $x = -\infty$ and $\varphi = 2\pi/\beta$ at $x = \infty$; the solution $\varphi(x)$ has a finite mass (energy at rest)

$$M_S = \frac{8m}{\beta^2} \quad (10)$$

and the running solution

$$\varphi_v(x, t) = \varphi \left(\frac{x - vt}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}} \right) \quad (11)$$

evidently corresponds to a particle. Let us stress that perturbative paradigm states that equation (7) describes just a particle of mass m . Equation (7) admits also a family of periodic solutions (breathers), which can be interpreted as bound states of two kinks with mass

$$M_B = 2M_S \sin \theta \quad , \quad (12)$$

where θ , $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$ characterises the internal periodic motion.

Quantization of this picture, performed quasiclassically by L. Takhtajan and me in 1973 [10], showed that variable θ became quantized, so that breathers produced the particle spectrum

$$m_n = \frac{2m}{\gamma} \sin \frac{\gamma n}{2} \quad , n = 1, \dots, \left[\frac{\pi}{\gamma} \right] \quad ; \quad \gamma = \frac{\beta^2}{8} \quad . \quad (13)$$

Later R. Dashen, B. Hasslacher and A. Neveu showed [11], that one loop correction leads to the finite renormalization

$$\gamma \rightarrow \gamma' = \frac{\gamma}{\pi - \gamma} \quad (14)$$

which, in particular, shows, that γ can not exceed π . Another interpretation of this fact was proposed by S. Coleman [12], who found a duality between SG model and Massive Thirring Model describing self interacting massive fermion. Soliton corresponds to basic fermion, whereas breather excitations are its bound states. The most striking feature of this duality is exchange of weak and strong interactions in two descriptions of the same physical system. It became prototype for many dualities discussed subsequently in physical literature, beginning with the paper of Montonen and Olive [13].

I have no time to discuss the development of Quantum Theory of Solitons with which I was connected for a long time since the beginning of the 70-ties. The achievements include the invention of Quantum Groups with their numerous applications both in Mathematics and CFT. A lot of examples of 1+1 dimensional models were quantized exactly, in particular the nonlinear σ -model, where the dimensional transmutation formula à-la (5) was derived rigorously.

In more realistic 3+1 dimensional space-time the success of solitons was less impressive. However, for $SU(2)$ YM field Yang and Wu [14] introduced a singular soliton

$$A_0^a = 0; \quad A_k^a = \frac{\epsilon_{iak} x^i}{r^2} \quad (15)$$

which is somehow an analogue of step-like soliton $\varphi_0(x, t)$ of SG model. Physically Yang–Wu soliton describes magnetic monopole. Indeed, one can find a gauge transformation, singular along the Dirac string, which will turn (15) into the usual configuration of abelian magnetic monopole (more on this later).

There exists no smoothed solution of YM equation, analogous to kink soliton $\varphi(x, t)$ of the SG model. However, such smoothening appears for the model including the Higgs field. It was shown independently by 't Hooft [15] and A. Polyakov [16] in 1974. Polyakov coined the name "hedgehog" for such a soliton. The monopole charge characterizes the following topological situation: the Higgs field of the static solution acquires different asymptotic values in different directions in 3-space $\mathbb{R}^3$ (thus the hedgehog) and defines the map of the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ of such directions into space of vacua moduli. In the case of $SU(2)$ group this space is also $\mathbb{S}^2$. The map

$$\mathbb{S}_{\text{space boundary}}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{\text{moduli}}^2 \quad (16)$$

has a topological degree — number of times the base covers the target — which is exactly the magnetic charge of the monopole. Thus topology produces charge, which conserves irrespectively of equations of motion. This feature is one more substantial addition to QFT brought in during the new period.

It is appropriate to remark here, that in his quest for nonquantum particles Einstein was eager to get such a picture [17]. So topological charges in some sense realize the Einstein's dream. However, in modern setting they stay against quantum principles in no way. On the contrary, topological charge enter quantum theory most naturally, e.g., via functional integral.

There is another possibility for the topological charges besides hedgehog-like configuration. It corresponds to really localized solitons, for which the boundary condition at infinity in space do not depend on direction. In this way the space $\mathbb{R}^3$ itself is compactified by addition of the point at infinity and topologically became a sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$. The static field then maps this $\mathbb{S}^3$ into the target space. As soon as this latter is compact, one can expect appearance of topological numbers.

An explicit example is given by Skyrme model, in which the target space is a compact group, so that the field corresponds to nonlinear σ -model. It is relevant to stress here, that Skyrme was the pioneer of using particle-like solution in high energy physics, his papers [18], appeared much before the solution fashion of mid 70-ties, however, he did not discuss quantization.

The field $g(x)$ of Skyrme model has values in compact group G . The boundary condition is

$$g|_{r \rightarrow \infty} = g_0 \quad , \quad (17)$$

where g_0 is a fixed element in G , i.e., just a unity. The lagrangian is described as follows. Introduce the current

$$L_\mu = \partial_\mu g g^{-1} \quad , \quad (18)$$

which gets its values in the Lie algebra of G . Then the lagrangian is defined as

$$\mathcal{L} = a \operatorname{tr} L_\mu^2 + b \operatorname{tr} ([L_\mu, L_\nu])^2 \quad (19)$$

where a and b are coupling constants, a has dimension of $(\text{mass})^2$ and b is dimensionless. The topological current

$$J_\mu = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \operatorname{tr} L_\nu [L_\rho, L_\sigma] \quad (20)$$

conserves $\partial_\mu J_\mu = 0$ irrespective of equations of motion and topological charge

$$Q = \int J_0 d^3x \quad (21)$$

acquires integer values upon some normalization.

It is evident, that static Hamiltonian density, corresponding to lagrangian (19) is a sum of squares of entities, product of which defines the density of topological charge. Thus the estimate

$$H_{static} \geq c|Q| \quad (22)$$

is valid, showing the possibilities for nontrivial static solitons in sectors with $Q \neq 0$. Indeed, the Skyrme soliton for $G = SU(2)$ and $Q = 1$ can be described rather explicitly and higher sectors produce a very rich family of particle-like solutions (see recent paper [19]).

One of additions to 3+1 dimensional solutions in mid 70-ties was my proposal to modify Skyrme model using as a target the 2-sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$, so that the field is a unit direction vector

$$\vec{n} = (n^1, n^2, n^3) \quad , n^2 = 1 \quad . \quad (23)$$

The boundary condition is

$$\vec{n}|_{r \rightarrow \infty} = n_0 = (0, 0, 1) \quad . \quad (24)$$

Thus static configuration defines a map

$$n : \quad \mathbb{S}_{\text{space}}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{\text{target}}^2 \quad (25)$$

which also can be characterized by some topological number — the Hopf invariant. Its origin is rather different from the degree of map.

The characteristic feature of map (25) is that the dimension of target is smaller than that of base by 1. So the generic point n in target has as a preimage a whole closed line. For two different values n' and n'' these lines have a definite linking. For regular configuration $n(x)$ such a linking does not depend on choice of n' and n'' . Thus an integer appears — the linking number of two preimages of the map n . This is a Hopf invariant. It is already clear from this picture that interesting configurations are not point-like but rather string-like.

Let us elaborate on this a little more. If our base is 2-dimensional, the field $n(x)$ defines the map $\mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ with usual degree of map. Embedding such configurations into 3-space one gets straight strings with infinite energy. Natural idea is to close them into a bounded object. However, a simple closure will not do. Indeed, the energy is proportional to the length and simple closed string will collapse. However, if one twists the string and/or knots it before closing, there is a chance, that such twist will increase with shortening of the string and raise the energy. Thus some stable configuration could appear. These simple considerations were leading for me in my proposal.

To construct the lagrangian, consider first the topological current corresponding to Hopf invariant. Define the antisymmetric 2-tensor

$$H_{\mu\nu} = (\partial_\mu n \times \partial_\nu n, n) \quad , \quad (26)$$

which is closed

$$\partial_\rho H_{\mu\nu} + \text{cycle} = 0 \quad , \quad (27)$$

so that there exists a vector field C_μ such that

$$H_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu C_\nu - \partial_\nu C_\mu \quad . \quad (28)$$

Then the current

$$J_\mu = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} H_{\nu\rho} C_\sigma \quad (29)$$

conserves and

$$Q = \int J_0 \, d^3x \quad (30)$$

is a Hopf invariant. Now the lagrangian is a natural variant for that of Skyrme

$$L = a(\partial_\mu n)^2 + bH_{\mu\nu}^2 \quad . \quad (31)$$

However, due to the nonlocality in the definition of Hopf charge (one is to integrate to get C_μ from $H_{\mu\nu}$), the simple estimate as (22) is not valid. It was shown by Kapitansky and Vakulenko [20], that the following estimate is true

$$H_{\text{static}} \geq c|Q|^{3/4}. \quad (32)$$

This is enough to expect the stable solutions in sectors with $Q \neq 0$.

It is natural to consider as a center of string-like soliton the line on which field n has the value opposite to the vacuum one (24), namely

$$n = (0, 0, -1). \quad (33)$$

The simplest case is axial symmetric, when this line is a circle. The separation of variables in axial symmetric case still leaves us with two variables on the base, so that to find a solution one is to solve nonlinear partial differential equation in two variables. In the 70-ties it was beyond the possibilities of computers. In contrast, for Skyrme model the spherically symmetric Ansatz exists, reducing the problem to ordinary differential equations. This is why the numerical realization of my hypothetical string-like solitons waited for more than 20 years.

The first result in this direction is due to A. Niemi, who agreed to learn basics of modern programming and got the facilities of the supercomputing center in Helsinki. The findings as well as conjectures were published by us in a paper in “Nature” with the title “Knots and Particles”. Needless to say, we were to make allusions to old ideas of Lord Kelvin [21].

During the last two years several more professional groups joined in the quest for finding string-like solitons and quite a rich picture appears now, see [22], [23], [24].

Thus a natural question appeared, namely, if it is possible to find the applications for these results in QFT. I shall finish my talk indicating a use of the n -field in description of the Yang–Mills field. This is a programme, which Niemi and me began to work on very recently [25].

One suggestive connection between n -field and $SU(2)$ Yang–Mills field is via Yang–Wu monopole. Indeed, if one puts

$$A_\mu^a = \epsilon^{abc} \partial_\mu n^b n^c \quad (34)$$

then for the hedgehog configuration

$$n^a = x^a/r \quad (35)$$

one gets exactly Yang–Wu monopole (15). The singular gauge transformation mentioned above is that of rotating n from (35) into constant direction like (24). This suggests that in a particular gauge n -field may constitute part of parameters for the Yang–Mills field. The field $n(x)$ is then to be interpreted as an order parameter of the monopole condensate.

The next question is if it is possible to complete the formula (34) to include a full set of independent field degrees of freedom. After some deliberations Niemi and me came to the formula

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{A}_\mu = C_\mu \vec{n} + \partial_\mu \vec{n} \times \vec{n} + \\ \rho \partial_\mu \vec{n} + \sigma \partial_\mu \vec{n} \times \vec{n},\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

where C_μ is abelian vector field and ρ and σ — two real scalar fields. One must consider this $\vec{A}_\mu$ as a Yang–Mills field in a partially fixed gauge. The gauge freedom left is the local rotation around vector $\vec{n}$, so that the infinitesimal gauge parameter takes the form

$$\vec{\epsilon} = \epsilon \vec{n}.\tag{37}$$

It is easy to see, that gauge variation

$$\delta \vec{A}_\mu = \partial_\mu \vec{\epsilon} + \vec{A}_\mu \times \vec{\epsilon}\tag{38}$$

corresponds to

$$\delta \vec{n} = 0 ; \delta \vec{C}_\mu = \partial_\mu \vec{\epsilon} ; \delta \rho = -\epsilon \sigma ; \delta \sigma = \epsilon \rho ,\tag{39}$$

so that C_μ transforms as abelian gauge field and pair (ρ, σ) constitutes corresponding charged scalar field. In fact, the first line in (36) corresponds to a particular connection and second line is a covariant vector field.

Connection of the first line in (36) and its generalization for $SU(3)$ group was considered in a series of papers of Cho [26]. However, he did not consider the problem of complete parametrization of YM field.

Let us show, why our parametrization can be complete in $3 + 1$ dimensional space–time. Indeed, usual counting gives 2 polarizations for every component of the massless vector field, thus $SU(2)$ Yang–Mills theory has $2 \times 3 = 6$ independent degrees of freedom. In our parametrization we have 2 degrees of freedom for C_μ , 2 for field $n(x)$ and 2 for pair (ρ, σ) . Altogether it gives 6, as needed.

Now let us briefly discuss the relevance of the knot lagrangian (31) in this new setting. It is clear that $H_{\mu\nu}$ from (26) enters into the curvature of full $\vec{A}_\mu$ from (36), so that the second term in (31) is already present in Yang–Mills lagrangian $1/g^2 \text{tr} F_{\mu\nu}^2$. The first term from (31) is of course absent as well as dimensional constant a . However, it can appear as an effective low energy term after integration over all fields but $n(x)$. Indeed, it is the first relevant term of the gradient expansion. Thus we propose the knot lagrangian (31) as an effective infrared lagrangian for QCD with knots being candidates for QCD strings relevant for confinement.

Returning to general parametrization (36) we see that according to our proposal the degrees of freedom of the $SU(2)$ Yang–Mills field separate into abelian vector field, magnetic monopole condensate $n(x)$ and charged scalar field. This

sounds very consonant to 't Hooft proposal of late 70-ties [27], which now goes with the name “abelian dominance”. We also hope, that we have a definite proposal for the origin of QCD strings, advertized by Polyakov [28]. Of course, lots of work is needed to substantiate this rather ambitious claim.

I add here some comments on the development which happened already after this lecture was given.

It was quite a satisfaction for Niemi and me to realize, that our Ansatz contains the axial-symmetric Ansatz of Witten [29] in his search for many-instanton solutions. Indeed, if one puts

$$n^a = \frac{x^a}{r}, \quad C_k = f(r, t) \frac{x^k}{r}, \quad C_0 = g(x, t) \quad (40)$$

formula (36) gives exactly Witten's Ansatz. We are indebted to W. Kummer for a very relevant question.

Of course, to do QCD one needs $SU(3)$ Yang-Mills field. Some Ansatz for $SU(N)$ was proposed by Periwal [30]. However, even for $SU(2)$ it differs from ours. So Niemi and me recently found a natural generalization of Ansatz (36) to $SU(N)$ [31]. The ingredients are $N - 1$ abelian vector fields, $\frac{N^2 - N}{2}$ complex scalars and nonlinear field with values in target of dimension $N^2 - N$. Altogether it gives $2(N^2 - 1)$ independent degrees of freedom as is needed for 3+1 dimensional space.

All this shows that solitons and Yang-Mills field are more intimately connected and can go together into QCD. I hope, that this also explains the title of my lecture.

I stop here my propaganda for QFT in the guise of Yang-Mills field. I understand that I do it in time of one more decline of interest to QFT due to the exciting development of string theory. Thus I deliberately take the conservative stance (and alluding to Gerard's metaphor must be considered not as an agile rat of the end of the 60-ties, but rather as clumsy dinosaur and should be extinct). However I do it because I believe that QFT is still a viable physical construction, which did not show yet all its possibilities. If I conveyed this message to some young people sitting here, I shall consider my mission successful.

References

- [1] A. Lichnerowicz, “Theorie globale des connections et des groupes d'holonomie”, Roma, Ed. Cremonese, 1955.
- [2] R. Feynman, *Acta Physica Polonica*, **24** (1963) 697.
- [3] L.D. Faddeev, V.N. Popov, *Phys. Lett.* **B25** (1967) 30.
- [4] V.N. Popov, L.D. Faddeev, preprint Kiev Inst. Theor. Phys. ITP 67-36, (1967).

- [5] L.D. Faddeev, Theor. Math. Phys. **1** (1969) 3.
- [6] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B35** (1971) 167.
- [7] D. Gross, preprint hep-th 9809060.
- [8] S. Coleman, Lectures given at 1973 International Summer School of Physics Ettore Majorana, Erice, Sicily, July 6-25 1973; Publ. in “Erice Subnuclear Physics” 1973.
- [9] R. Jackiw, Talk at the Conference on Foundations of QFT, Boston Mass. March 1996, hep-th 9602122.
- [10] L.D. Faddeev, L.A. Takhtajan, Uspehy Math. Nauk, 29(1974) 249; Theor. Math. Phys. **21** (1974) 160.
- [11] R. Dashen, B. Hasslacher, A. Neveu, Phys. Rev. **D11** (1975) 3724.
- [12] S. Coleman, Phys. Rev. **D11** (1975) 2088.
- [13] C. Montonen, D. Olive, Phys. Lett. **72B** (1977) 117.
- [14] C.N. Yang, T.T. Wu in “Properties of Matter Under Unusual Condition” ed. H. Mark and S. Fernhach, Interscience, NY, 1969.
- [15] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B79** (1974) 2761.
- [16] A. Polyakov, JETP Lett. **20** (1974) 430.
- [17] A. Einstein, “On the Methods of Theoretical Physics”, Spencer Lecture delivered in Oxford 10 June 1933; Clarendon Press 1933.
- [18] T.H.R. Skyrme, Proc. Roy. Soc., London, Ser. A; **247** (1958) 260; **260** (1961) 127; **262** (1961) 237.
- [19] C.J. Houghton, N.S. Manton, P.M. Sutcliffe, Nucl. Phys. **B510** (1998) 507.
- [20] A.F. Vakulenko, L.V. Kapitansky, Sov. Phys. Doklady, **24** (1979) 433.
- [21] L.D. Faddeev, A. Niemi, Nature, 387 (1997) 58.
- [22] L.D. Faddeev, A. Niemi, preprint hep-th 9705176.
- [23] R.A. Batlye, P.M. Sutcliffe, preprints hep-th 9808129, 9811077.
- [24] Y. Hietarinta, preprint hep-th 9811053.
- [25] L.D. Faddeev, A. Niemi, preprint hep-th 9807069.

- [26] Y.M. Cho, Phys. Rev. **D21** (1980) 1080; Phys. Rev. **D23** (1981) 2415; Phys. Rev. Lett. **46** (1981) 302.
- [27] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B153** (1979) 141; Nucl. Phys. **B120** (1977) 455.
- [28] A. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. **B120** (1977) 429.
- [29] E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett., **98** (1977) 121.
- [30] V. Periwal, preprint hep-th 9808127.
- [31] L.D. Faddeev, A. Niemi, preprint hep-th 9812090.